SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

UPDATED AUGUST 28, 2020

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

***Instructions for applicants*:**

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:
Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals: [help]

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

A. Background [help]

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: [help]
   Kelkari - Phase 2 and 3 of the approved Kelkari residential development

   2020 Update: Kelkari, Phase 3 – Minor Amendment to approved MSP (MSPA16-00001)

2. Name of applicant: [help]
   IS Property Investments LLC

   2020 Update: Kelkari Two Development LLC

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: [help]
   Applicant: **IS Property Investments LLC, Attn: David MacDuff**
   419 Occidental Avenue South, Suite 300, Seattle, WA 98104
   Contact: **Anna M. Nelson, Land Use Planner, Van Ness Feldman LLP**
   719 2nd Ave, Ste 1150, Seattle, WA 98104

   2020 Update:

   Applicant: **David MacDuff, Authorized Agent**
   Kelkari Two Development LLC
   411 1st Ave. S, Suite 650
   Seattle, WA 98104

   Contact: **Tim McHarg, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner**
   Van Ness Feldman LLP
   719 2nd Ave, Suite 1150, Seattle WA 98104
   Ph: (206) 817-6977
   Email: tmcharg@vnf.com

4. Date checklist prepared: [help]
   September 16, 2016

   2020 Update: August 28, 2020

5. Agency requesting checklist: [help]
   City of Issaquah

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): [help]
   Commence site construction in May 2017.

   2020 Update: Phase 3 construction will begin in Spring, 2021.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. [help]
   No. The Master Site Plan (MSP), Site Development Permit (SDP) and Binding Site Plan (BSP) for Kelkari were approved in 1998 (Resolution No. 98-15). The original project included 189 dwelling units and a detached clubhouse. Phase 1, which included 63 units and the clubhouse, has already been constructed. A portion of the development area for Phase 2 has been cleared and graded, and site improvements (i.e. main access road and stormwater

management system/vault) have been constructed. Modified Phase 2 and 3, which include 54 fewer units than previously approved, are the only remaining phases.

2020 Update: No. Phase 1 is completed. Phase 2 has been permitted and is under construction. Phase 3 is the only remaining phase to be permitted.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be pepared, directly related to this proposal. [help]

Final EIS – The Kelkari Multifamily Residential Development	**July 1996**
Draft EIS – The Kelkari Multifamily Residential Development	**April 23, 1996**
Updated SEPA Checklist	**August 28, 2020**
Geotechnical Engineering Review Letter, including Detention Tank Cross Sections | Terra Associates	**August 27, 2020**
Storm Drainage Plans, Sheets C4.01, C4.23, C4.31, C4.32 and C4.33 | CORE	**August 24, 2020**
Minor Modification Storm Drainage Calculations | CORE	**August 18, 2020**
Letter regarding Building 9 Footing Design | Yu & Trochalakis	**August 27, 2020**
Kelkari Townhomes Building 9 Structural Plans, Sheet 3.00 | Yu & Trochalakis	**August 25, 2020**
Phase 3 TIR | CORE	**November 26, 2019**
Phase 2 TIR | CORE	**April 24, 2019**
Approved Phase 2 Site Work Permit (SW19-00016)	**June 3, 2019**
Preliminary TIR (Phases 2 and 3) | CORE	**May 23, 2017**
DNS and Staff Report, Kelkari Phases 2 and 3 Minor Amendment	**December 12, 2016**
SEPA Compliance Narrative for SEPA addendum	**September 2016**
Site Disturance Exhibit | CORE	**09/19/2016**
Wall Exhibit (2 sheets) | CORE	**08/30/2016**
Wetland & Stream Delineation Study | Watershed	**02/12/2016**
Critical Areas Study | Mitigation Plan | Watershed	**02/15/2016**
Tech Memo *Kelkari Wetland Comparison* | Watershed	**04/13/2016**
Wetland Stream Delineation Study | Watershed	**07/19/2016**
Response to ESA 07-19-16 Rev. 07-22-16 | Watershed	**07/22/2016**
Response to 2nd ESA Review | Watershed	**08/31/2016**
Biological Evaluation | Watershed	**02/15/2016**
BIO Evaluation re: NWS-2016-119 | CORPS	**05/31/2016**
ESA Section 7 Informal Consultation | NMFS	**07/06/2016**
Geotechnical Report | Terra Assoc.	**12/29/2015**
Critical Areas Report | Terra Assoc.	**02/11/2016**
Critical Areas Report (revised) | Terra Assoc.	**07/19/2016**
GeoTech Review Letter | Terra Assoc.	**07/19/2016**
Slope stability results for CAR analysis | Terra Assoc.	**08/18/2016**
Geotech Memo re Site Plan Review | Terra Assoc.	**08/30/2016**
Cultural Resources Assessment | Tierra ROW	**01/22/2016**
COE: NWS-2016-00119 - Concurrence Determination No Historic Properties Affected | Wash Dept. of Archaeology & Historic Preservation (DAHP)	**07/13/2016**
Traffic Impact Analysis | TENW	**02/08/2016**

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. [help]
No.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. [help]
    - **City of Issaquah minor amendments to Master Site Plan, Site Development Permit and Binding Site Plan. File No: MSPA 16-00001; BSP 16-00001; ASDP 16-00004**
    - **City of Issaquah site construction and building permits.**
    - **City of Issaquah Master Site Plan extension.**
    - **Department of Ecology NPDES General Stormwater Permit**
    - **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit 29. File No. NWS-2016-0119**

    2020 Update: City of Issaquah Minor Amendment to to approved MSP (MSPA16-00001)

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.) [help]
The modified Kelkari proposal maintains the multifamily residential use with a reduction in the total number of dwelling units from 189 to 135 dwelling units. Instead of 6 large-scale multi-family buildings, Phase 2 and 3 of the modified project will include a series of townhouse style buildings, with a maximum height not to exceed 45 feet. The buildings, access, site amenities and parking are generally located in the same areas previously approved for development. See attached September 19, 2016 Site Disturbance Exhibit. A more detailed description is provided in the February 2016 Project Narrative (although the total proposed unit count for Phases 2 and 3 have been reduced from 75 to 72) and September 2016 SEPA Compliance Narrative.

    2020 Update: The proposed Minor Amendment to the approved Kelkari MSP (MSPA16-00001) is for an increase to the allowed impervious surface in Phase 3. The Minor Amendment makes no changes to approved Phases 1 or 2. There are no substantive changes to the Phase 3 site layout as approved by MSPA16-00001 and ASDP16-00004.

    The Minor Amendment to the MSP is to increase the allowable impervious surface area for land use purposes in Phase 3 from 1.46 acres to 1.85 acres. The 1.46 acre current allowable impervious area for land use purposes in Phase 3 was provided by the City in the approved notes from a June 25, 2020 teleconference with the applicant. The increase is proposed based on the Issaquah Municipal Code ("IMC") methodology for calculating impervious surface for land use purposes.

    The Minor Amendment to the MSP is proposing a maximum storm drainage impervious surface area from 1.52 acres to 1.81 acres for Phase 3. The 1.52 acre current allowable impervious area for "vested" storm drainage design in Phase 3 was provided by the City in the approved notes from a June 25, 2020 teleconference with the applicant. Storm drainage flow control/detention design for 1.52 acres of impervious will be based on the 1990 KCSWDM standards as amended by the IMC, to which Phase 3 is vested. All additional impervious area for stormwater purposes up to the maximum of 1.81 acres would be modeled per the current storm drainage standards (2014 DOE Manual).

    The Minor Amendment to the MSP proposes a maximum "vested" pollution generating

impervious surface (PGIS) of 0.64 acre for Phase 3, which conists of treatment for phosphorus only. The PGIS allowance represents a 5% increase from the 0.61 acre approved as the preliminary design by MSPA16-00001 and ASDP16-00004. PGIS amounts exceeding 0.64 acres would be treated per current standards, which includes phosphorus and enhanced treatment. In other words, PGIS is not limited but, will be treated differently based on its area.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist. [help]
1000 Cabin Creek Lane SW, Issaquah, WA
Parcel Nos. 380090-0010; 0020; 0070; 0080; 0090; 0100; 0120; 0130
SE ¼, Section 33, Township 24N, Range 6E.
See proposed modified site plan prepared by CORE dated August 30, 2016.

2020 Update:

1100 Prospect Lane SW, Issaquah, WA
Parcel Nos. 380090-0080; -0090; -0100; -0120
SE ¼, Section 33, Township 24N, Range 6E.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS [help]

1. Earth [help]

a. General description of the site: [help]

(circle one): Flat, **rolling, hilly, steep slopes**, mountainous, other _____
Phase 2 has been cleared and graded and site improvements (i.e. main access road and stormwater management system/vault) have been constructed. Parcel C adjacent to Phase 2 contains some steep slopes. Phase 3 is hilly, with steep slopes in adjacent Parcel B.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? [help]
Most slopes on the site are between 15 and 30%, with some areas over 40% slopes.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils. [help]
The onsite soils are classified as Alderwood gravelly sandy loam 15 to 30 percent slopes and Beausite gravelly sandy loam 15 to 30 percent slopes by the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe. [help]
Nearby coal mine hazard areas were analyzed in the EIS. However, those were primarily located in Phase 1. There are no documented coal mine workings under

Phase 2 and 3 and the amount of mine tailings observed are not considered a hazard (*see* Kelkari Critical Areas Report revised July 19, 2016 by Terra Associates, Inc).

The Foothills landslide was also considered based on its location approximately 500 feet southeast of Phase 3. In addition to geologic differences, the sites also differ in predevelopment land use and proposed grading and drainage. The proposed grading along with the planned interceptor drains result in a stable development (*see* Kelkari Critical Areas Report revised July 19, 2016 by Terra Associates, Inc).

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill. [help]
The project will disturb approximately 5.05 Acres. The site will be graded to provide access, utility corridors and building pads for the project. The source of the excavations and embankments onsite will be from onsite material. Approximately 6,000 to 7,000 cubic yards of material will be removed off site.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. [help]
With the existing slope gradients, the onsite soils have a moderate to severe potential for erosion during clearing and construction. Erosion will be controlled in accordance with an approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and by conducting site construction in the dry season. The stormwater management facilities will ensure that erosion will not result from the future residential use.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)? [help]
Environmental impacts associated with impervious surfaces were evaluated as part of the previous approvals (MSP/SDP/BSP). The modified project has the same impervious surface as the approved project (see August 30, 2016 CORE plans and calculations below).

	Original Design Impervious	Proposed/Constructed Impervious
Basin 1 (Phase 3) Roofs	0.86 acre	0.92 acre
Basin 2 (Phase 2) Roofs (Incl. walkways to Sunrise)	0.93 acre	0.84 acre
Basin 3 (Phase 1) Roofs	0.86 acre	0.69 acre
Basins 1-3 (Phases 1-3) Roads	1.82 acres	2.02 acres
Totals	4.47 acres	4.47 acres

This is a further reduction to the impervious surfaces shown from the December 16, 2015 Preliminary Technical Information Report from CORE proposed with the initial submittal in February 2016 and a further reduction from the increase described in the September 1, 2016 SEPA compliance narrative.

2020 Update: The Minor Amendment proposes the following increase in impervious surface for land use calculations:

Phase	Constructed/Approved Impervious	Proposed Impervious
1	1.40 acres	1.40 acres
2	1.61 acres	1.61 acres
3	1.46 acres	1.85 acres
Total	4.47 acres	4.86 acres

Sources: Phase 1 constructed impervious area is from Preliminary TIR approved with MSPA16-00001 and ASDP16-00004. Phase 2 constructed impervious area is from approved SW18-00016.

The Minor Amendment proposes the following increase in impervious surface for stormwater calculations:

Phase	Impervious Surface Type	Constructed/Approved Impervious	Proposed Impervious	
1	Clean	0.69 acres	0.69 acres	1.40 acres
	PGIS	0.71 acres	0.71 acres	
2	Clean	0.88 acres	0.88 acres	1.65 acres
	PGIS	0.67 acres	0.67 acres	
3	Clean	1.52 acres	1.81 acres[1,2]	1.81 acres[1,2]
	PGIS			
Total		4.47 acres	4.76 acres	4.76 acres

Source: Phase 1 and 2 impervious surface type and area is from approved Phase 2 TIR.

[1] Vested stormwater detention standards apply to Phase 3 impervious coverage up to 1.52 acres. Current stormwater detention standards apply to the Phase 3 excess impervious coverage exceeding 1.52 acres.
[2] PGIS not to exceed 0.64 acre under vested storm standards. PGIS permitted to exceed 0.64 acre if treatment includes both enhanced and phosphorus mitigation.

Note that the differences in the two tables between impervious surface areas within Phases 1 and 2 are due to:

- **LID credits were applied to the stormwater impervious surface in Phase 2; and,**
- **Retaining wall surface area is/was not included in the stormwater impervious surface calculations.**

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any: [help]
Erosion will be controlled in accordance with an approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and by conducting site construction in the dry season. The stormwater management facilities will ensure that erosion will not result from the future residential use. Slope easements were previously provided (AFN 19990617000615 and easements shown on BSP).The prior analysis of potential impacts from erosion, seismic hazards, steep slopes, and landslides is not substantially changed by the modified proposal and Terra Associates has responded to the City's peer review comments (see Terra Associates geotechnical and critical area reports dated December 29, 2015 and July 19, 2016, and responses dated July 19, 2016, August 18, 2016 and August 30, 2016). The site grading, proposed 10-foot steep slope buffer and 15-foot BSBL shown on the August 30, 2016 site and grading plan are appropriate measures, given the results of the slope stability analysis prepared by Terra and

the 10-foot buffer and 15-foot BSBL is the same as the approved project. The proposed grading, along with the planned interceptor drains, will result in a stable development. Implementation of temporary and permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) for preventing and controlling erosion prior to, during, and immediately following construction activities will mitigate the erosion hazards. The walls will be designed to ensure no adverse impacts. Additionally, the December 29, 2015 geotechnical report will be updated as part of the construction permitting to respond to the City's peer review comments.

2. Air [help]

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known. [help]
Some dust and emissions may result during site clearing, grading, and construction. Due to the proposed reduction in the number of residential uses, vehicular emissions from the project will be reduced.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. [help]
No. There are no known significant sources of emissions in the vicinity.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any: [help]
Site preparation and construction will follow best management practices to minimize emission of fugitive dust in the vicinity. Wood fireplaces will not be provided in the dwelling units.

3. **Water** [help]

a. Surface Water:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into. [help]
Cabin Creek is located within Parcel B near the proposed access to Phase 3. Together, Phase 2 and 3 contain six wetlands and various intermittent streams. See August 30, 2016 CORE plan and technical reports and memorandums prepared by The Watershed Company.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans. [help]
Yes. The 1999 Decision Document identified required buffers for Cabin Creek and wetlands (Conclusion F.33.), and the direct fill of 5,837 sf of wetlands and 1,300 sf of paper fill was indicated on the MSP site plan. A NWP, which has since expired, was approved for the wetand fill and Cabin Creek restoration. The wetland paper fill, 50-foot wetland buffer, 15-foot BSBL and wetland mitigation area were subsequently shown on the recorded BSP. A 50-foot buffer and 15-foot BSBL were subsequently shown on the recorded BSP.

The modified development reduces the area of direct wetland fill to 4,403 s.f. and increases the "paper fill" area to 6,064 s.f. The 50-foot wetland buffer for Wetland 1 and Wetland 3 is maintained and a 14,976 s.f. wetland mitigation area within Parcel B is provided (*see* Kelkari Wetland and Stream Delineation Study dated February 12, 2016, Issaquah Kelkari Critical Areas Study dated February 2016, Wetland and Stream Delineation Study dated July 19, 2016, all by The Watershed Company).

Modifications have been made to the proposal with respect to the intermittent streams that were identified in the EIS (*see* The Watershed Company letters dated July 22, 2016 and August 31, 2016). While the EIS mitigation noted 25 to 50 foot buffers around all streams, a 50-foot buffer was only required for Cabin Creek. Based on the City peer review and further delineation of the intermittent streams, the proposal has been modified to avoid stream impacts and provide a 25-foot buffer and 15-foot BSBL for the intermittent streams.

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material. [help]

The table below is updated from prior Watershed reports and September 1, 2016 compliance narrative, and reflects the final delineation confirmed by ESA (the City's peer review consultant). See the August 30, 2016 CORE plan for the location of the numbered wetlands.

Size of Prior and Current Wetlands and Wetland Impact

Critical Area 1997	Size of Wetland (square feet) w/impact noted (* or **)	Critical Area 2015 & 2016	Size of Wetland (square feet) w/impact noted (* or **)
Wetland B1	13,579 1,306*	Wetland #1	16,571 2,878*
Wetland B2	3,719 (on-site)	Wetland #3	Size Unknown. Partially off-site
Wetland H	1,000**	Wetland #2	1,156 1,053* / 103**
Wetland G	2,642**	Wetland #4	2,286 1,413* / 537**
Wetland K	1,028**	Wetland #5	3,763 3,763**
Wetland C	743	Wetland #6	1,348 720*
Wetland I	473**	Non-wetland area	NA
Wetland J	694**	Non-wetland area	NA
Total	Paper fill = 1,306		Paper fill = 6,064
Total	Direct fill = 5,837		Direct fill = 4,403

*Wetland as buffer, no direct fill impact (i.e., 'paper fill')
**Direct wetland fill.

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. [help]
No.

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan. [help]
No.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge. [help]
No.

b. Ground Water:

1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. [help]

No.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve. [help]
None.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe. [help]
As stated in the 1999 Decision Document, storm drainage for the site is adequately designed (Finding 16). The approved design mitigated for the impacts identified in the EIS (i.e., roof runoff, road runoff, construction impacts, fertilizers and pesticides). To ensure that the modified proposal and the revised stormwater design will continue to mitigation for the identified impacts, additional analysis was performed to ensure that stormwater runoff from the development would continue to mitigate for impacts associated with stormwater runoff (*see* Preliminary Technical Information Report by CORE Design dated December 16, 2015). This subsequent analysis demonstrated that the February 2016 modified proposal would have had only a minor increase in impervious surface, and that the stormwater system will provide the applicable flow reduction and water quality treatment standards. Additionally, subsequent to preparation of the Preliminary TIR, the proposal has been modified further (reduced by 3 dwelling units) so that the impervious surface is the same as the approved proposal.

In regard to the method of collection and disposal, four stormwater detention vaults, with a combined storage capacity of 18,798 cubic feet, will be constructed as part of the modified proposal. The net result of the proposed detention will be a significant reduction in peak flows discharging into Issaquah Creek. The peak discharge associated with the 100-year storm event will be reduced from 0.79 cfs to 0.49 cfs for Phase 2, and from 1.22 cfs to 0.77 cfs for Phase 3. The proposed stormwater treatment will provide 50 percent removal of phosphorus in accordance with the 1990 King County Stormwater Manual, thereby mitigating impacts on streams.

2020 Update: 1.52 acres of impervious area within Phase III would be modeled per the Issaquah Creek Basin and Nonpoint Action Plan, adopted by the City of Issaquah in October 1995 and the **1990 KCSWDM standards as amended by the IMC, to which Phase 3 is vested. All additional impervious area for stormwater purposes up to the maximum of 1.81 acres would be modeled per the current storm drainage standards (2014 DOE Manual).**

The TIR prepared by CORE Design, dated November 26, 2019, modeled the proposed impervious as 1.50 acres, resulting in an 8 foot diameter, 196 lineal foot detention tank using the "vested" drainage standards . For the proposed increase to 1.81 acres of impervious, 1.52 acres would be modeled using the vested drainage standards as amended by the Issaquah IMC, and the remaining 0.29 acres would be modeled using the 2014 DOE Manual as amended by the Issaquah IMC. Based on that methodology, the modeling indicates that an 8 foot diameter, 262 lineal foot detention tank is required. This prelinary modeling will be refined as part of final design to determine final detention tank sizing. Note that final design

and detention tank sizing may change from this summary, which is based on preliminary modeling and design. Final design and detention tank sizing will be subject to review and approval by the City as part of the Phase 3 SWP.

Water quality treatment will be designed per the vested City standards during development of the original Kelkari for a PGIS up to 0.64 acre. This vested standard requires 50% phosphorus removal. If the PGIS exceeds 0.64 acre, the treatment system will be designed to meet the 2014 DOE Manual standards which requires bothphosphorus and enhanced treatment, and a biopod system, in place of the storm filter system, will be installed.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. [help]
No.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe. [help]
No. The modified proposal has no increase in impervious surface over the approved project. Stormwater will be collected, detained, treated, and released to its natural receiving waters.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any: [help]
The impervious surface will be the same as the approved project and the proposed stormwater design described above and in the preliminary TIR will control stormwater impacts. The modified project also reduces the area of direct wetland fill, maintains the recorded 50-foot wetland buffer on the development and 15-foot BSBL and provides for a larger wetland mitigation area within Parcel B (from 5,250 s.f. to 14,976 s.f.). The Applicant has mitigated the additional impacted "paper" fill area at the same ratio identified in the EIS for the direct fill (i.e., the EIS mitigation for the direct fill is 1:1) and increased the ratio for direct fill to 2:1. As a result, the modified proposal provides a net benefit to wetlands. Additionally, the recorded BSP will be modified so that all the wetlands, streams and associated buffers will be located in the common Parcels instead of partially on the development lots.

As an alternative to these on-site wetland impact measures, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has indicated a preference for use of the King County Mitigation Reserve Program (King County ILF) instead of the on-site mitigation. As such, in order to obtain the required NWP 29, the modified proposal will be required by the Corps to utilize ILF credits to compensate for the wetland impacts and an ILF Use Plan is scheduled to be submitted to the Corps by the end of September. As the approved project included on-site mitigation and the mitigation area was recorded on the BSP, a minor modification to the City approvals would be necessary to utilize ILF for City review and approval of wetland impacts. Use of the ILF for purposes of the City review will be made during the review of the minor modifications (File No: MSPA 16-00001; BSP 16-00001; ASDP 16-00004).

2020 Update: There will be no changes or additional impacts to critical areas as a result of the Minor Amendment.

Runoff from additional impervious surface exceeding the 1.52 acres approved for Phase 3 by MSPA16-00001 will be detained and released based on the standards of the 2014 DOE Manual. For the proposed additional 0.29 acres up to the maximum impervious stormwater surface area of 1.81 acres, this will result in a longer detention tank to accommodate additional volume. With the additional detention tank length, the setbacks of the tank from the right-of-way will be a minimum of five (5) feet and from the building foundations wil be a

minimum of three (3) feet. Water quality treatment will be designed per the vested City standards during the development of the original Kelkari up to a PGIS of 0.64 acre. If PGIS exceeds 0.64 acre, treatment will meet the requirements of the 2014 DOE standards.

4. **Plants** [help]

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site: [help]

_X__deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
_X__evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
_X__shrubs
_X__grass
____pasture
____crop or grain
____ Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
_X_ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
____water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
____other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? [help]
No significant change in vegetation removal from the approved project. See Site Disturbance Exhibit dated September 19, 2016.

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. [help]
List is included in Biological Evaluation prepared by Watershed dated February 15, 2016. As part of the NWP 29 review, on July 7, 2016 the National Marine Fisheries Service concurred that the proposal is unlikely to adversely affect NMFS ESA-listed species and/or designated critical habitat.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: [help]
The project has been designed to preserve large portions of existing vegetation. This design approach is continued in the proposed minor amendment. Wetland mitigation areas will include planting of native vegetation and project landscaping will incorporate native vegetation similar to the approved project.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site. [help]
Himilayan Blackberry, ivy and morning glory are common invasive plants in the region.

5. **Animals** [help]

a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. [help]

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, ***songbirds***, other:
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, ***other***:
fish: bass, **salmon**, trout, herring, shellfish, other

The property is most likely utilized by various songbirds, small mammals, common amphibians and reptiles, and species suited to life in urban/suburban settings. Chinook and coho salmon use Cabin Creek and benefit from the Phase 1 enhancements that were made to Cabin Creek.

b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. [help]
Chinook and coho salmon.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain. [help]
The site is within the Pacific Flyway bird migration route.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any: [help]
All of the modified proposal's potential impacts on Chinook and coho salmon EFH have been considered (*see* Biological Evaluation dated February 2016 by The Watershed Company). Although construction could have a temporary adverse affect on essential fish habitat, such effects would be minor and minimized by the construction BMPs that will be in place. Long-term effects will be a net benefit, as peak storm flows will be reduced due to the proposed stormwater detention facilities, and any water quality effects related to stormwater will remain insignificant.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site. [help]
None known.

6. **Energy and Natural Resources** [help]

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc. [help]
Heating and cooling needs of the proposed residences will be served by electricity and natural gas.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe. [help]
No.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any: [help]
The buildings will comply with Building Code energy conservation requirements.

7. **Environmental Health** [help]

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe. [help]
No.

1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses. [help]
None.

2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity. [help]
None.

3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project. [help]
None.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required. [help]
No special emergency service would be required. General emergency service impacts related to the additional residential development were evaluated with the original approval. The reduction in the number of units will have a corresponding reduction in the need for emergency services.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: [help]
None required.

b. Noise [help]

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)? [help]
None.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site. [help]
Temporary short-term noise will be generated from construction equipment and construction traffic. Long-term noise will occur from vehicular traffic and from residential uses. These noise impacts were identified in the EIS. The reduction in total units will have a corresponding reduction in long-term noise associated with vehicular trips.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: [help]
As indicated in the EIS, no significant traffic noise impacts would result from the approved action. The modified proposal represents a reduction in potential long-term noise impacts. Construction will be restricted to 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, and weekends as permitted. Noise levels during and after construction will comply with WAC 173-60.

8. **Land and Shoreline Use** [help]

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe. [help]
The modified proposal does not change the proposed use of the property and the use of the adjacent properties remains the same (Single-family to east, multifamily to west and wooded park to south). The use of the property for multi-family residential was approved as part of the previous MSP, SDP, and BSP (Resolution No. 98-15) and is consistent with the current multi-family zoning. The modified proposal results in a decrease in the proposed number of dwelling units from 189 to 135. The development will continue to be a multifamily residential development. The modified project will include a series of townhouse style buildings, with a maximum height not-to-exceed 45 feet. The change in building type responds to the changing residential market demand and provides for a more respectful transition to the adjacent lower density uses. The buildings, access, site amenities, access, and surface parking are generally located in the same areas previously approved for development. As explained in the Applicant's project and code compliance narrative, the modified proposal meets the criteria for a minor amendment to the MSP and SDP and an alteration exception

for the BSP. Land use, recreational facilities, and aesthetic impacts will continue to be mitigated through the modified proposal design and compliance with the Decision Document conditions of approval.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use? [help]
No.

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how: [help]
No.

c. Describe any structures on the site. [help]
Other than Phase 1 buildings and Phase 1 and Phase 2 stormwater and access improvements made in accordance with the approved MSP, SPD and BSP, the site is vacant.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what? [help]
No.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? [help]
Multifamily Medium (MF-M)

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? [help]
Multifamily Residential

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? [help]
Not applicable.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify. [help]
Yes. There are onsite wetlands, streams, steep slopes and coal mine hazard areas. See reports prepared by Watershed and Terra Associates.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? [help]
Based on the number of dwelling units (72), the number of bedrooms per unit, and the anticipated demographics of the future residents, approximately 180 people would reside in Phase 2 and 3.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? [help]
None.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: [help]
None necessary.

L. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: [help]
The change in building type proposed as part of the modified project responds to the changing residential market demand and provides for a more respectful transition to the adjacent lower density uses.

2020 Update: The proposed increase in Phase 3 impervious for land use purposes from 1.46 acres to 1.85 acres results in a total project impervious surface coverage of 4.86 acres for Phases 1 – 3. The overall project site is 31.2 acres. The proposed impervious coverage ratio is 15.6%. This is an increase of 1.3% from the 14.3% impervious coverage ratio approved by MSPA16-00001 and ASDP16-00004. The proposed impervious surface coverage ratio is less than one third of the 50% ratio permitted in the MF-M zone based on the vested zoning code standards.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any: [help]
Not applicable.

9. **Housing** [help]

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. [help]
The modified proposal reduces the total number of dwelling units in the project from 189 to 135 (63 units in Phase 1, 35 units in Phase 2 and 37 units in Phase 3). Phase 2 and 3 units will range between high- to middle-income.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. [help]
No existing units would be eliminated.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: [help]
None necessary.

10. **Aesthetics** [help]

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed? [help]
The proposed townhouse style buildings will have a maximum height of 45 feet.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed? [help]
Because the proposed building heights and massing are smaller than the approved project, the views along Sunrise Place SW will be enhanced

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: [help]
The buildings, access, site amenities and surface parking are generally located in the same areas previously approved for development. See Site Disturbance Exhibit dated September 19, 2016 and site sections on Wall Exhibit dated August 30, 2016. The architectural character of the existing residential buildings in Phase 1 will be matched in the proposed buildings.

11. **Light and Glare** [help]

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur? [help]
The project will include lighting typical of residential uses, which would mainly occur at night.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? [help]

No safety hazards or view interference associated with light or glare will result from the project.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? [help]
None.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: [help]
None necessary. The modified proposal will be designed consistent with the requirements in IMC 18.07.107 to control potential impacts.

12. **Recreation** [help]

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity? [help]
The Squak Mountain Access Trail was built with Phase 1 and provides access to Squak Mountain State Park.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe. [help]
No. A short segment of the Squak Mountain Access Trail in Phase 2 will be relocated approximately 15 feet to provide separation from a residential entrance walkway in proposed Building 4. The entrance to the Squak Mountain Access Trail in Phase 3 will be temporarily rerouted during construction of the wetland creation area. The Phase I resident recreational amenities and clubhouse will remain and be available for residents of Phase 2 and 3.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: [help]
Signage will be provided for the temporary rerouting of the trail segments. The existing kiosk at the trailhead in Phase 3 will be improved with interpretative signage. Other on-site recreational amenities and walkway linkages will be provided for the residents of Phase 2 and 3, with access allowed for Phase 1 residents. The Phase I resident recreational amenities and clubhouse will remain and be available for residents of Phase 2 and 3.

13. **Historic and cultural preservation** [help]

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers ? If so, specifically describe. [help]
No. S*ee* Cultural Resources Assessment by Tierra Right-of-Way dated January 22, 2016).

b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources. [help]
Five previously recorded archaeological sites have been recorded off-site within 1 mile of Phase 3, all of which are Historic period sites and isolated occurrences. See Cultural Resources Assessment by Tierra Right-of-Way dated January 22, 2016).

c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc. [help]
The site has been previously disturbed and the EIS indicated that no impacts were expected because of the site disturbance and development location. A field survey was conducted based on the modified proposal design and to satisfy regulatory

requirements for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in support of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) permit for the project (*see* Cultural Resources Assessment by Tierra Right-of-Way dated January 22, 2016). Tierra recommends a finding of No Effect to Historic Properties and that the project be permitted to continue without further archaeological oversight. The Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation concurred with the determination that no historic properties are affected (*see* DAHP letter dated July 13, 2016).

d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required. [help]
None.

14. **Transportation** [help]

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any. [help]
Sunrise Place SW serves the site. Site access to Phase 2 would be provided via an existing private roadway (Cabin Creek Lane SW). Access to Phase 3 is proposed at the same location from Sunrise Place SW as the approved proposal.

b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop? [help]
The nearest transit stop is along Newport Way SW.

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate? [help]
Each of the units will include a 2 car garage. Additional surface parking for Phase 2 is available in the common parking area adjacent to the clubhouse (21 parking spaces), and the proposed 4 parallel spaces north of Building 4, and 3 spaces north of Building 7 Surface parking for Phase 3 will be provided with 8 spaces accessed from the interior road and approximately 16 on-street spaces on the south side of Sunrise Place SW.

d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private). [help]
A fog line will be added to the south side of Sunrise Place SW to delineate the on-street parking.

e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe. [help]
No.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates? [help]
As shown on the February 8, 2016 TENW analysis, the modified project submittal would generate approximately 500 daily, 27 a.m. (4 entering and 23 exiting), and 34 p.m. peak hour vehicular trips (22 entering and 12 exiting). This represents a net decrease from the approved project of approximately 444 fewer daily— 40 fewer a.m. peak hour, and 49 fewer p.m. peak hour—vehicular trips than those trip generation levels evaluated and mitigated as part of the original approval. With the reduction of 3 more dwelling units, from 75 proposed

in February 2016 to 72 in the August 30, 2016 plan, there are now 41 fewer AM Peak Hour, 50 fewer PM Peak hour and 462 fewer Daily trips than the approved proposal.

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe. [help]
No.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: [help]
The modified proposal does not give rise to any new significant adverse impacts that were not analyzed in the 1996 EIS. All impacts of the modified proposal are within the range of alternatives and significant impacts analyzed in the 1996 EIS and approved in the 1999 Decision Document.

No change in land use is proposed, as the development will continue to be a multifamily residential development. There will be 41 fewer AM Peak Hour, 50 fewer PM Peak hour, and 462 fewer Daily trips than the approved proposal. In addition to analyzing the trip generation, Transportation Engineering Northwest also evaluated the modified proposal as to sight distance, pedestrian safety, turn lane warrants, and on-site circulation. TENW concluded that adequate entering/stopping sight distance would be provided at the existing/proposed driveways onto Sunrise Place SW and within the internal site drive aisles. Since traffic volumes along Sunrise Place SW and interior to the project are low, no separated or marked crosswalk treatments are warranted.

A review of separate left turning lanes concluded they would not be warranted given existing low volumes on Sunrise Place SW and low left turning volumes into either Phase driveway.

15. **Public Services** [help]

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe. [help]
The public service impacts of additional residential development were evaluated with the original approval. The reduction in the number of units will have a corresponding reduction in the need for public services.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any. [help]
The modified on-site access design has been coordinated with Eastside Fire District to ensure access by the District's equipment.

16. **Utilities** [help]

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: [help]
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____

d. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed. [help]
The modified proposal will include installation of the following utilities:
Water – City of Issaquah
Sewer – City of Issaquah
Power – PSE
Gas – PSE

Cable - Comcast

C. Signature [help]

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature:
Name of signee **Anna Marie Nelson, AICP**
Position and Agency/Organization **Van Ness Feldman**
Date Submitted: **September 20, 2016**

Signature:
Name of signee **Tim McHarg, AICP**
Position and Agency/Organization: **Senior Land Use Planner, Van Ness Feldman**
Date Submitted: **July 16, 2020**